

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on November 18, 2010 has been received and its contents have been carefully considered.

In this Amendment, the Applicants have amended claims 23, 26, 28, 29, 33, 34, 49, 51, and 52, and cancelled claim 27. New claims 54 and 55 are added to further protect the invention. Support for the amendments to the claims can at least be found in paragraphs [0040]-[0048] of the originally filed application. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added. Claims 23, 28, 49, 54 and 55 are the independent claims. Claims 23-26, 28-36 and 49-55 are now pending in the application.

Claim 28 is objected to because of the informalities. In response, claim 28 has been amend to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Therefore, the objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph. Claims 51 and 52 have been amended to point our and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 23-25, 49, 50 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Ichbiah (US 5,623,406, hereinafter "*Ichbiah*"). Claims 23 and 49 has been amended, and it is

submitted that amended claims 23 and 49, as well as their dependent claims 24-25, 50 and 53, are patentable over the cited reference for at least the following reasons.

Amended claim 23 recites:

“A communication device comprising:

an input device for inputting text character-by-character from a sequence of characters;

a memory device for storing a plurality of reference character sequences of characters; and

a prediction device for comparing individual ones of the input characters with the reference character sequences and for proposing at least one of the reference character sequences after the inputting of individual input characters of the sequence of characters to be input provides a corresponding comparison result,

wherein the prediction device compares the input characters to characters that are not directly adjacent to the reference character sequences;

wherein the input device is an interactive display device on which characters are displayed in a text input area and are touch-sensitively selectable for inputting, and **wherein the prediction device uses drawing movement between various characters of the text input area for marking separated characters of a single coherent character sequence.**” (*Emphasis added*)

In contrast, *Ichbiah* discloses a system for entering text in computer equipment.

However, it is clear from Figs. 2 and 3, and col. 6, lines 40-43 of *Ichbiah* that user types characters to the system. Therefore, *Ichbiah* fails to disclose any drawing movement, and it is respectfully submitted that *Ichbiah* fails to disclose that the prediction device uses ***drawing***

movement between various characters of the text input area for marking ***separated*** characters of a single coherent character sequence, as recited in amended claim 23.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that the currently amended claim 23 is patentable over the cited reference. Claim 49 has features similar to those of the claim 23, and thus it is respectfully submitted that the claim 49 is patentable over the cited reference for the same reasons that the claim 23 is patentable. Claims 24-25, 50 and 53, dependent from claims 23 and 49, respectively, recite additional features to further define the invention, and are therefore patentable along with their independent claims. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 26, 27 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ichbiah* in view of Buxton et al. (US 6,094,197, hereinafter “*Buxton*”). Claim 27 has been cancelled, and claims 26 and 52 depend from claims 23 and 49, respectively, and Buxton fails to disclose that the prediction device uses ***drawing movement*** between various characters of the text input area for marking ***separated*** characters of a single coherent character sequence, as recited in amended claim 23, and fails to disclose a drawing movement between various characters of the touch-sensitive text input area is for marking ***separated*** characters of a single coherent character sequence, as recited in amended claim 52. Instead, as disclosed in abstract and clear in Fig. 3, ***an upward stroke is for making capital character***. Therefore, *Buxton* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Ichbiah*, and accordingly the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 28, 34-36 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ichbiah* in view of Venema (US 4,893,238, hereinafter “*Venema*”). Claims 28, 34 and 51 have been amended, and it is submitted that claims 28, 34-36 and 51 are patentable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Amended claim 28 recites:

“A communication device, comprising:

an input device for entering text character-by-character from a sequence of characters;

a memory device for storing a plurality of reference character sequences of characters; and

a prediction device for comparing individual ones of the input characters with the reference character sequences and for proposing at least one of the reference character sequences after the inputting of individual input characters of the sequence of characters to be input provides a corresponding comparison result,

wherein the input device uses drawing movements to enter a number of syllables with respect to two input characters of the sequence of characters to be input, and

wherein the prediction device compares the number of input syllables with corresponding numbers of syllables of the reference character sequences”

(Emphasis added)

As discussed above, *Ichbiah* fails to disclose any drawing movement. Therefore, *Ichbiah* fails to disclose that the input device uses drawing movements to enter a number of syllables

with respect to two input characters of the sequence of characters to be input, as recited in amended claim 28.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the device taught by *Venema* uses drawing movements to enter a number of syllables with respect to two input characters of the sequence of characters to be input or uses ***drawing movement*** between various characters of the text input area for marking ***separated*** characters of a single coherent character sequence. Therefore, *Venema* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Ichbiah*.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 28 is patentable over the cited references because the cited reference fails to teach or disclose each and every features in claim 28. Claims 34-36 and 51, dependent from claims 23, 28 and 49, recite additional features to further define the invention, and are therefore patentable along with their independent claims. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ichbiah* in view of *Venema* and *Buxton*. However, *Venema* and *Buxton* fail to cure the deficiencies of *Ichbiah*. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition, claims 54 and 55 are added to further protect the subject matter of the invention. It is respectfully submitted that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest these features as claimed since claims 54 and 55 have features similar to those of the claim 23. Therefore it is submitted that claims 54 and 55 should be allowed for the same reasons as discussed in connection with claim 23.

Based on the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and such a Notice, with allowed claims 23-26, 28-36, and 49-55, earnestly is solicited.

If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

2011/2/18
Date

/Ivan Su/
I-van Su
Reg. No.: 58,226